Update on the 7th Year Report for University of California Berkeley
June 2013

Overview of this Report
This report presents information on the 7th Year Report for University of California Berkeley

Staff Recommendation
No action is needed.

Background to this Report
The accreditation system allows the COA to request a 7th year report from any institution after an accreditation site visit. In cases where the institution receives stipulations, their 7th year report is the same as their response to the stipulations. However, the COA may request institutions receiving **Accreditation** to also provide a 7th year report. These reports typically are requested where there are one or more Common or program standards less than fully met. These reports require no action by the COA, however, they do provide some assurance that the institution is taking appropriate and timely steps to ensure alignment with all standards.

For the 2011-12 accreditation year, University of California Berkeley was granted the accreditation status of **Accreditation** with the requirement that they submit a 7th year report.
A copy of the March 4–7, 2012 site visit report may be found at:
https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/07-UC%20Berkeley-FINAL.pdf?-db=PSD_Program_Sponsors_DB&-lay=web_Accreditation_Reports&-recid=96&-field=COA_Report_Site_Visit

Additionally, the letter that was sent following the May 30, 2012, COA action may be found at:
https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/2012-05-130%20UCB%20Accreditation%20(3).pdf?-db=PSD_Program_Sponsors_DB&-lay=web_Accreditation_Reports&-recid=96&-field=COA_Letter.

The 7th year report required that UC Berkeley provide "an update on Common Standards 1, 8, and 9 and on Program Standard 15 for the Multiple Subject/Single Subject Programs, and on Program Standards 1, 6, and 7 for the Career/Technical Education (CTE) Program." Specifically, the report would address the following issues identified by the site visit team:

(a) evidence of involvement of external stakeholders in the governance of teacher education programs
(b) evidence of training in supervision for district-employed field supervisors in teacher education programs
(c) evidence that in the Career Technical Education (CTE) program, both the description of program design and the evaluation of candidate competence are aligned with the CTE Model Curriculum Standards and that the program bases CTE teachers' competence on the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for initial program and on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs) for the advanced program.

UC Berkeley submitted a narrative report and substantiating evidence of actions taken over the last year to address each of the issues. Staff has reviewed the report as well as the evidence which was submitted in the form of appendices and presents the following summary:

Governance of Teacher Education Programs – Common Standard 1
Page 11 of the Accreditation report outlines the findings of the site visit team with respect to Common Standard 1

> *In some programs external stakeholders are also involved in the governance of the credential programs through their participation in advisory boards; however, neither the unit nor some of the teacher education programs have a formal mechanism for the involvement of external stakeholders in the design and governance of the program. For example, in the recent redesign of the Developmental Teacher Education program, there has been careful and extensive work by faculty; however, there is no evidence of involvement of field supervisors, employers, or completers. The GSE has indicated plans to institute both a unit-wide advisory board and an advisory board for the teacher education programs; however, the groups are not yet fully constituted and have not yet met.*
>
> *Rationale for Standard 1 Findings:*
> *While for some programs the team reviewed evidence of involvement of external stakeholders in the governance of the credential programs, there was no formal evidence that "...relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs."*

Steps Taken by UCB to Address Common Standard 1 (Submitted by UCB)
Since the site visit, we have organized and convened two advisory groups that involve external stakeholders in the governance of our programs: the campus-wide Institutional 2 Advisory Group (IAG); and the more specifically focused Teacher Education Advisory Group (TEAG). The Institutional Advisory Group (IAG) spans all four campus entities that are home to professional programs in education: the Graduate School of Education; the School of Social Work; the College of Letters and Sciences; and University Extension. The IAG comprises two external stakeholders from each of these entities. It has been charged with providing advice from the field, as well as discussing ways that our professional education programs "unit" can address cross-cutting themes, such as the preparation of candidates with and for technology, and meeting the needs of the whole child. Members were recruited in Fall 2012 and a first meeting was held February 25, 2013, attended jointly by both the IAG members and the faculty and administrative leadership from each of the credential programs. The IAG will meet annually

The Teacher Education Advisory Group (TEAG) is composed of school administrators, mentor teachers and practicing teachers. This group specifically advises the academic coordinators for each of our teacher education programs about issues in the field, and was instrumental in helping us design our response to Common Standard 8 and Program Standard 15; providing training for cooperating teachers. This group met first in May 2012 and again in October 2012, with a third meeting scheduled for May 2013. The TEAG will meet twice a year

District Employed Supervisors – Common Standard 8 and Program Standard 15

Page 18 of the Accreditation report outlines the findings of the site visit team with respect to Common Standard 8:

> *There is an unevenness regarding training in supervision for each program. The teacher education programs do not provide systematic training for the supervisory role for district-employed supervisors but have indicated to the team they intend to do so by fall 2012.*
>
> ***Rationale for Standard 8 Finding:***
> *This standard is met with concerns due to the fact that not all field-based supervisors in all programs are trained for the supervisory role. Plans are in place to implement appropriate training by fall 2012.*

Page 20 of the Accreditation report outlines the findings with respect to Program Standard 15:

> ***Findings on Standards***
> *Based on the careful review of the program documents, supporting artifacts on TEIIS database, interviews (with current candidates and program completers, partners, supervisors and cooperating teachers, county office personnel, faculty and staff, program personnel, district partners and employers), the team determined that all program standards are **Met** except for the following that was **Met with Concerns**:*
>
> ***Program Standard 15: Qualifications of Individuals who Provide School Site Support***
> *While there are opportunities for supervisors, cooperating teachers and program personnel to meet and discuss working with candidates in the field, the team was unable to verify that "Sponsors of programs provide ongoing professional development opportunities for supervisors…."*

Steps Taken by UCB to Address Common Standard 8 and Program Standard 15 (Submitted by UCB)

In order to create training in supervision for district-employed field supervisors, we first surveyed our 150 cooperating teachers to generate a list of issues that were most pressing for cooperating teachers as they work with student teachers. We shared the results of this survey with our TEAG members, who agreed that support for cooperating teachers was necessary, and who helped us think through what we could provide that would be most useful to cooperating teachers. Since then, we have created a *Cooperating Teacher Handbook* that defines our expectations of cooperating teachers and explains our program philosophy. That handbook will be delivered to cooperating teachers at the three-way meeting, conducted prior to the placement, between the cooperating teacher, the student teacher, and the university supervisor. We will also host biannual cooperating teacher network events that include guest speakers with expertise in coaching, as well as breakout sessions that offer cooperating teachers the opportunity to share best practices and challenges in mentorship with other teachers, role-play difficult mentorship scenarios and examine case studies and video. The first training event will be held September 21, 2013 (A Draft of the Cooperating Teacher Handbook and a Draft Plan for Cooperating Teacher Network Day was received).

Alignment of CTE program standards and assessments - Common Standard 9 and Program Standards 1, 6 and 7

Page 19 of the Accreditation report outlines the findings of the site visit team with respect to Common Standard 9:

> *Rationale for Standard 9 Finding:*
> *At this time there was insufficient evidence that the CTE program assessments were aligned with the required TPEs and CSTPs.*

Page 33 of the Accreditation report outlines the findings of the site visit team with respect to Program Standards 1, 6 and 7:

> **Findings on Standards 1, 6 and 7**
> *After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, as previously indicated, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** with the exception of the following that are **Not Met**:*
>
> *CTE Program Standard 1: The team found insufficient evidence that the coursework is aligned to the "...state-adopted CTE Model Curriculum Standards and Framework and that CTE teachers' competence aligns with the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)."*
>
> *CTE Program Standard 6: The team found insufficient evidence that the "...program uses formative and summative assessments to determine CTE teachers' competence based on the TPEs."*
>
> *CTE Program Standard 7: The team found insufficient evidence that the "...advanced preparation program is designed to support teachers' attainment of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and to advance the beginning teacher outcomes described in Category II." It is important to note that this finding is limited to the advanced program is not yet operating. Therefore, this issue can be addressed before candidates are enrolled in this program.*

Steps Taken by UCB to Address Common Standard 9 and Program Standards 1, 6 and 7

Common Standard 9
University Extension's DSCTE program has been designed to assure a cohesive organizational structure, taking into consideration the required administrative and curriculum components. Program elements in the two-level structure have been arranged to form a logical sequence of instruction (scaffolding) and supervised field experiences, recognizing that knowledge gained at an earlier level should serve as a foundation for the more advanced level. The Initial Preparation program consists of the Early Orientation, Instructional Strategies, Curriculum Design and Assessment, SDAIE/Special Needs, CTE Foundations, and Integrating Technology. The Advanced Preparation phase comprises of Portfolio A and B courses in which candidates fulfill the field experience component and develop a portfolio.

Program Standard 1
Extension's DSCTE program is aligned with the CTE Model Curriculum Standards and the program bases CTE teachers' competence on the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for initial program and on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession for the advanced program.

Below is a Table detailing the alignment of the DSCTE program with the TPE's and CSTPs

DSCTE Courses	Teacher Preparation Expectation (TPE)	California Standards for the Teaching Profession
Initial Preparation Courses:		
Early Orientation (X366.13)	Standards 6, 8, 9, 12 and 13	Standards: 1, 4 and 6
Instructional Strategies (X366.14)	Standards: 1, 2,3, 4, 6, 8,9, 10, and 11	Standards: 1, 3, 4, and 5
Integrating Technology (X366.15)	Standards 1, 4, 5, 6, and 13	Standards: 1, 3, and 6
Curriculum Design and Assessment (X366.16)	Standards: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 11	Standards: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5
SDAIE/Special Needs (X366.17)	Standards: 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 12	Standards: 1, 4, 5, and 6
Career Technical Foundations	Standards: 3, 4, 11, 12, and 13	Standards: 1, 5, and 6

Advanced Preparation Courses		
Advanced Preparation Portfolio A & B (X366. 19 X366.20)	Standards: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13	Standards; 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6

Extension's DSCTE program also addresses learning and teaching styles, multiple intelligences and temperament applications in the teaching standards.

The DSCTE candidates reviewed the draft CTE Model Curricular Standards in fall 2012 and had an opportunity to post their comments on the CDE website. Each of the courses in the DSCTE program addresses the CTE Model Curricular Standards.   For example, candidates in the Early Orientation course do an in-depth assignment where they familiarize themselves with the CTE Model Curriculum Standards and present to the class on what they have learned. The candidates respond to open-ended questions during the presentation. In the Curriculum Design and Assessment and Instructional Strategies classes, students create course outlines and lesson plans based on their industry sector. Plans are also underway to engage in curriculum mapping this fall to ensure that nothing is omitted in the DSCTE program.

Program Standard 6 – Determination of CTE Teacher Competence
Program Standard 7 – Advanced Programs of Preparation
Below are the steps that UC Berkeley has taken in response to the site visit team's concerns regarding Program Standard 6 and Program Standard 7:

The DSCTE program uses both formative and summative assessment to determine CTE teachers' competence based on the TPEs. All candidates are required to complete elements of the Initial

and Advanced Preparation components. Each program element has measureable objectives, and each instructor has ample opportunity to determine a candidate's mastery of each objective through assessment and observation of student via discussions, demonstrations, projects, written/oral reports, reflection pieces, and/or written/oral examination. Candidates are also required to do PowerPoint presentations to their classmates in every course. A passing grade is verification that a candidate has mastered the course objectives and is competent in that area.

Also beginning Fall 2012, assessments of student teaching performance are collected in all on-line database referred to as TEIIS. In addition to tracking individual student performance and making the information available to the appropriate people (candidate, supervisors, and instructors) it increases the ability to use the results of candidate assessments to guide program improvements.

The program uses CSTP's to assess DSCTE candidate teaching competency. The candidate, mentor teacher, and the instructor at Extension use a Teacher Evaluation form to observe the mentor teacher; the mentor teacher and instructor at Extension use the form to observe the candidate's teaching competency.

The program uses a rubric assessment to evaluate the overall achievement of CSTPs. The candidate and the mentor teacher observe each other's teaching at least three times. Candidates in the DSCTE program also create a Portfolio that documents their accomplishments and chronicles their progress throughout the year. Each DSCTE candidate receives ongoing support and mentoring from instructors at Extension as well as the mentor teacher and school principal.

The DSCTE teaching credential program has an active Advisory Board consisting of district and regional representatives from the Bay Area. The DSCTE Advisory Board meets each year to review the status of the program and provide information about needs of local school districts. In addition, instructors from the DSCTE program serve on the Instructional Advisory Group (IAG) for UC Berkeley's professional education programs. The Berkeley IAG consists of members with years of experience and knowledge in the education community.

Next Steps
UC Berkeley has complied with the COA request for a 7th year report. Staff will take COA direction as to whether additional information is needed in the future.